

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
WESTERN DIVISION AT DAYTON**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	:	
	:	Case No. 3:16cr00007
Plaintiff,	:	
vs.	:	District Judge Walter Herbert Rice
	:	Chief Magistrate Judge Sharon L. Ovington
KATHRYN ELIZABETH WILLIAMS,	:	
Defendant.	:	

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS¹

This case came on for hearing on January 20, 2016. The United States was represented by Assistant United States Attorney Brent Tabacchi, and Defendant Kathryn Elizabeth Williams was represented by Lawrence Joseph Greger.

The parties have entered into a plea agreement, which has been filed of record. The undersigned carefully inquired of Defendant regarding her understanding of the agreement as well as her competence to understand the agreement. Having fully inquired, the undersigned Judicial Officer finds that Defendant's tendered plea of guilty to Count One of the Information is knowing, intelligent and voluntary. Based on the statement of facts as set forth in the plea colloquy the undersigned finds that there is a sufficient factual basis for a

¹ Attached hereto is NOTICE to the parties regarding objections to this Report and Recommendations.

finding of guilty as to Count One.

It is accordingly recommended that the Court accept the plea of guilty to Count One of the Information and find Defendant guilty as charged in such Count of Theft of Government Property (less than \$1,000) in violation of 18 U.S.C. §641.

Pending the Court's acceptance of Defendant's plea, she has been referred to the Probation Department for a pre-sentence investigation.

January 21, 2016

s/Sharon L. Ovington
Sharon L. Ovington
Chief United States Magistrate Judge

NOTICE REGARDING OBJECTIONS

Pursuant to Fed. R. Crim. P. 59(b), any party may serve and file specific, written objections to the proposed findings and recommendations within **FOURTEEN** days after being served with this Report and Recommendations. Pursuant to Fed. R. Crim. P. 49(c) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(d), this period is extended to **SEVENTEEN** days because this Report is being served by one of the methods of service listed in Fed. R. Civ. P. 5(b)(2)(C), (D), (E), or (F). Such objections shall specify the portions of the Report objected to and shall be accompanied by a memorandum of law in support of the objections. If the Report and Recommendation is based in whole or in part upon matters occurring of record at an oral hearing, the objecting party shall promptly arrange for the transcription of the record, or such portions of it as all parties may agree upon or the Magistrate Judge deems sufficient, unless the assigned District Judge otherwise directs. A party may respond to another party's objections within **FOURTEEN** days after being served with a copy thereof.

Failure to make objections in accordance with this procedure may forfeit rights on appeal. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *United States v. Walters*, 638 F.2d 947, 949-50 (6th Cir. 1981).